arXiv:1105.2595v2 [math.PR] 14 Jul 2012

Applied Probability Trust (20 January 2013)

ON JOINT RUIN PROBABILITIES OF A TWO-DIMENSIONAL RISK MODEL WITH CONSTANT INTEREST RATE

ZECHUN HU,[*] *Nanjing University*

BIN JIANG,[**] *Monash University*

Abstract

In this note we consider the two-dimensional risk model introduced in Avram et al. [2] with constant interest rate. We derive the integral-differential equations of the Laplace transforms, and asymptotic expressions for the finite time ruin probabilities with respect to the joint ruin times $T_{\max}(u_1, u_2)$ and $T_{\min}(u_1, u_2)$ respectively.

Keywords: Two-dimensional risk model; constant interest rate; joint ruin probability; integral-differential equation; asymptotic expression

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification: Primary 91B30
Secondary 60J25

1. Introduction and Preliminaries

Ruin theory for the univariate risk model has been studied extensively, see Asmussen [1], Rolski et al. [10] and many recent papers. Contrarily, there are only a few research on multivariate risk models. Chan et al. [5] studied the following two-dimensional risk model

$$\begin{pmatrix} U_1(t) \\ U_2(t) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} u_1 \\ u_2 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} c_1 \\ c_2 \end{pmatrix} t - \sum_{j=1}^{N(t)} \begin{pmatrix} X_{1j} \\ X_{2j} \end{pmatrix},$$

---

[*] Postal address: Department of Mathematics, Nanjing University, Nanjing 210093, China.
Email address: huzc@nju.edu.cn

[**] Postal address: Department of Econometrics and Business Statistics, Monash University, Clayton, Victoria 3800, Australia. Email address: bin.jiang@monash.edu

where for fixed $i = 1$ or 2, $\{X_{ij}, j = 1, 2, \ldots\}$ are i.i.d. claim size random variables, $\{X_{1j}, j = 1, 2, \ldots\}$ and $\{X_{2j}, j = 1, 2, \ldots\}$ are independent, and both of them are also independent of the Poisson process $N(t)$.

Cai and Li [3] studied the multivariate risk model

$$\begin{pmatrix} U_1(t) \\ \vdots \\ U_s(t) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} u_1 + p_1 t - \sum_{n=1}^{N(t)} X_{1,n} \\ \vdots \\ u_s + p_s t - \sum_{n=1}^{N(t)} X_{s,n} \end{pmatrix}, \tag{1.1}$$

where $\{(X_{1,n}, \ldots, X_{s,n}), n \geq 1\}$ is a sequence of i.i.d. non-negative random vectors, and independent of the Poisson process $N(t)$. The model (1.1) was further studied by Cai and Li in [4].

Yuen et al. [11] discussed the bivariate compound Poisson model

$$\begin{pmatrix} U_1(t) \\ U_2(t) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} u_1 \\ u_2 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} c_1 \\ c_2 \end{pmatrix} t - \begin{pmatrix} \sum\limits_{i=1}^{M_1(t)+M(t)} X_i \\ \sum\limits_{i=1}^{M_2(t)+M(t)} Y_i \end{pmatrix},$$

where $M_1(t), M_2(t)$ and $M(t)$ are three independent Poisson processes, $X_i (Y_i)$ are i.i.d. claim size random variables, $\{X_i, i \geq 1\}$ and $\{Y_i, i \geq 1\}$ are independent and they are independent of the three Poisson processes.

Li et al. [7] discussed the bidimemsional perturbed risk model

$$\begin{pmatrix} U_1(t) \\ U_2(t) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} u_1 \\ u_2 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} c_1 \\ c_2 \end{pmatrix} t - \sum_{j=1}^{N(t)} \begin{pmatrix} X_{1j} \\ X_{2j} \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_1 B_1(t) \\ \sigma_2 B_2(t) \end{pmatrix},$$

where $N(t)$ is a Poisson process, $\{(X_{1j}, X_{2j}), j \geq 1\}$ is a sequence of i.i.d. random vectors, $(B_1(t), B_2(t))$ is a standard bidimensional Brownian motion, and the three processes are mutually independent.

Avram et al. [2] studied the two-dimensional risk model below

$$\begin{pmatrix} U_1(t) \\ U_2(t) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} u_1 \\ u_2 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} c_1 \\ c_2 \end{pmatrix} t - \begin{pmatrix} \delta_1 \\ \delta_2 \end{pmatrix} S(t), \tag{1.2}$$

where $S(t)$ is a Lévy process with only upward jumps that represents the cumulative amount of claims up to time t, and the paper focuses on the classic Cramér-Lundberg model, i.e. $S(t)$ is a compound Poisson process.

In this note, we discuss the above two-dimensional risk model (1.2) with constant interest rate. About univariate ruin models with investment income, there have been a lot of research. Please refer to the recent survey paper Paulsen [8] and the references therein.

Now we introduce our model. Let r be a nonnegative constant, which represents the interest rate. Then our model can be expressed as follows:

$$U_i(t) = e^{rt}u_i + c_i \int_0^t e^{r(t-v)}dv - \delta_i \int_0^t e^{r(t-v)}dS_v,\ i = 1, 2, \tag{1.3}$$

where u_i are the initial reserves, c_i are the premium rates, and $0 < \delta_1, \delta_2 < 1$ with $\delta_1 + \delta_2 = 1$. S_t is taken to be a compound Poisson process, i.e. $S_t = \sum\limits_{k=1}^{N(t)} \sigma_k,\ t \geq 0$, where $N(t)$ is a Poisson process with intensity $\lambda > 0$ and $\{\sigma_k, k \geq 1\}$ is a sequence of i.i.d. random variables independent of $N(t)$. Denote by F the distribution function, by f the probability density function of σ_k, respectively. Let θ_k be the arrival time of the k-th claim. Then we can rewrite (1.3) as

$$U_i(t) = e^{rt}u_i + \frac{c_i}{r}(e^{rt} - 1) - \delta_i \sum_{k=1}^{N(t)} e^{r(t-\theta_k)}\sigma_k,\ i = 1, 2. \tag{1.4}$$

For $k = 1, 2, \ldots$, denote by T_k the inter-time between the $(k-1)$-th claim and the k-th claim. Then $\{T_k, k \geq 1\}$ is a sequence of i.i.d. random variables with exponential distribution with the parameter λ, and $\theta_k = \sum_{i=1}^{k} T_i$.

Define two joint ruin times by

$$T_{\min}(u_1, u_2) := \inf\{t \geq 0 | \min\{U_1(t), U_2(t)\} < 0\},$$
$$T_{\max}(u_1, u_2) := \inf\{t \geq 0 | \max\{U_1(t), U_2(t)\} < 0\},$$

and the corresponding ruin probabilities

$$\psi_{\min}(u_1, u_2) := P\{T_{\min}(u_1, u_2) < \infty\},$$
$$\psi_{\max}(u_1, u_2) := P\{T_{\max}(u_1, u_2) < \infty\}.$$

As in [2], we assume that $c_1/\delta_1 > c_2/\delta_2$. Then if $u_1/\delta_1 > u_2/\delta_2$, the above two joint ruin probabilities degenerate into one-dimensional ruin probabilities as follows:

$$\psi_{\min}(u_1, u_2) = \psi_2(u_2) := P\{\exists\, t < \infty\ s.t.\ U_2(t) < 0\},$$
$$\psi_{\max}(u_1, u_2) = \psi_1(u_1) := P\{\exists\, t < \infty\ s.t.\ U_1(t) < 0\}.$$

Refer to [2] for the deduction. Throughout the rest of this note, we assume that $c_1/\delta_1 > c_2/\delta_2$ and $u_1/\delta_1 \leq u_2/\delta_2$.

Remark 1.1. For each i, we know that

$$U_i(t) = e^{rt}u_i + c_i \int_0^t e^{r(t-v)}dv - \delta_i \int_0^t e^{r(t-v)}dS_v = e^{rt}u_i + \int_0^t e^{r(t-v)}d(c_i v - \delta_i S_v).$$

Denote $\vec{U}(t) = (U_1(t), U_2(t))$, $\vec{u} = (u_1, u_2)$ and $\vec{Z}_v = (c_1 v - \delta_1 S_v, c_2 v - \delta_2 S_v)$. Then we have

$$\vec{U}(t) = e^{rt}\vec{u} + \int_0^t e^{r(t-v)}d\vec{Z}_v = e^{rt}\left(\vec{u} + \int_0^t e^{-rv}d\vec{Z}_v\right). \tag{1.5}$$

Differentiating both sides of (1.5) relative to t, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} d\vec{U}(t) &= re^{rt}\left(\vec{u} + \int_0^t e^{-rv}d\vec{Z}_v\right)dt + e^{rt}e^{-rt}d\vec{Z}_t \\ &= r\vec{U}(t)dt + d\vec{Z}_t. \end{aligned} \tag{1.6}$$

Integrating both sides of (1.6) relative to t, we get

$$\vec{U}(t) = \vec{U}(0) + r\int_0^t \vec{U}(s)ds + \int_0^t d\vec{Z}_s. \tag{1.7}$$

By (1.7) and the fact that $(t, \vec{Z}_t) = (t, c_1 t - \delta_1 S(t), c_2 t - \delta_2 S(t))$ are a three-dimensional Lévy process, following Protter [9, Theorem 32], we know that $\vec{U}(t)$ is a two-dimensional homogeneous strong Markov process.

The rest of this note is organized as follows. In Section 2, we show the integral-differential equations of the Laplace transforms of the joint ruin times $T_{\min}(u_1, u_2)$ and $T_{\max}(u_1, u_2)$ respectively. In Section 3, we provide two asymptotic expressions for the finite time ruin probabilities with respect to the joint ruin time $T_{\max}(u_1, u_2)$ and $T_{\min}(u_1, u_2)$ respectively.

2. Integral-differential equation

In this section, we establish the integral-differential equations of the Laplace transforms of the joint ruin times $T_{\min}(u_1, u_2)$ and $T_{\max}(u_1, u_2)$ respectively.

2.1. The result about $T_{\min}(u_1, u_2)$

In this subsection, we consider the joint ruin time $T_{\min}(u_1, u_2)$. For convenience, we denote $T_{\min}(u_1, u_2)$ by $\tau(u_1, u_2)$. Its Laplace transform is defined by

$$\Psi_{\min}(u_1, u_2, s) := E\left[e^{-s\tau(u_1,u_2)}\right], \quad \text{for } s > 0. \tag{2.1}$$

Then

$$0 \le \Psi_{\min}(u_1, u_2, s) \le 1. \tag{2.2}$$

Now we have the following result.

Theorem 2.1. *For $\frac{u_1}{\delta_1} \le \frac{u_2}{\delta_2}$ and $s > 0$, the function $\Psi_{\min}(\cdot, \cdot, s)$ satisfies the following integral-differential equation*

$$\begin{aligned}\left(u_1 + \frac{c_1}{r}\right)\frac{\partial \Psi_{\min}}{\partial u_1} + \left(u_2 + \frac{c_2}{r}\right)\frac{\partial \Psi_{\min}}{\partial u_2} - \frac{\lambda + s}{r}\Psi_{\min} \\ + \frac{\lambda}{r}\int_0^\infty \Psi_{\min}(u_1 - \delta_1 z, u_2 - \delta_2 z, s) f(z) dz = 0\end{aligned} \tag{2.3}$$

with the boundary condition

$$\Psi_{\min}(u_1, \frac{\delta_2}{\delta_1}u_1, s) = E\left[e^{-s\tau_2(\frac{\delta_2}{\delta_1}u_1)}\right], \tag{2.4}$$

where $f(z)$ is the probability density function of σ_k and τ_2 is the ruin time of risk process $U_2(t)$. Furthermore, $\Psi_{\min}$ is the unique solution of (2.3)-(2.4).

Proof. **Existence:** For any $h > 0$, by considering the occurrence time T_1 of the first claim, we have

$$E[e^{-s\tau(u_1,u_2)}] = E[e^{-s\tau(u_1,u_2)}, T_1 > h] + E[e^{-s\tau(u_1,u_2)}, T_1 \le h]. \tag{2.5}$$

For any $t \ge 0$, denote by $\mathcal{F}_t$ the information of the two-dimensional risk process $\{(U_1(s), U_2(s)) : s \ge 0\}$ up to time t, and by θ_t the shift operator of the sample path, i.e. $(\theta_t(\omega))_s = \omega_{s+t}$ for any sample path $\omega = (\omega_s, s \ge 0)$. By the properties of conditional expectation and the strong Markov property, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&E[e^{-s\tau(u_1,u_2)},T_1>h]=E[e^{-s\tau(u_1,u_2)}\mathbf{1}_{\{T_1>h\}}]\\
&=E[E[e^{-s\tau(u_1,u_2)}\mathbf{1}_{\{T_1>h\}}|\mathcal{F}_h]]\\
&=E[\mathbf{1}_{\{T_1>h\}}E[e^{-s[h+\tau\circ\theta_h]}|\mathcal{F}_h]]\\
&=E\left[\mathbf{1}_{\{T_1>h\}}e^{-sh}E_{(U_1(h),U_2(h))}[e^{-s\tau}]\right]\\
&=\int_h^\infty e^{-sh}\Psi_{\min}\left(e^{rh}u_1+\frac{c_1}{r}(e^{rh}-1),e^{rh}u_2+\frac{c_2}{r}(e^{rh}-1),s\right)\lambda e^{-\lambda u}du\\
&=e^{-(\lambda+s)h}\Psi_{\min}\left(e^{rh}u_1+\frac{c_1}{r}(e^{rh}-1),e^{rh}u_2+\frac{c_2}{r}(e^{rh}-1),s\right). \qquad (2.6)
\end{aligned}$$

For the second item on the right side of (2.5), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&E[e^{-s\tau(u_1,u_2)},T_1\le h]\\
&=E\left[e^{-s\tau(u_1,u_2)},T_1\le h,\sigma_1\le\frac{e^{rT_1}u_1+\frac{c_1}{r}(e^{rT_1}-1)}{\delta_1}\wedge\frac{e^{rT_1}u_2+\frac{c_2}{r}(e^{rT_1}-1)}{\delta_2}\right]\\
&+E\left[e^{-s\tau},T_1\le h,\sigma_1>\frac{e^{rT_1}u_1+\frac{c_1}{r}(e^{rT_1}-1)}{\delta_1}\wedge\frac{e^{rT_1}u_2+\frac{c_2}{r}(e^{rT_1}-1)}{\delta_2}\right]. \qquad (2.7)
\end{aligned}$$

By the strong Markov property, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&E\left[e^{-s\tau(u_1,u_2)},T_1\le h,\sigma_1\le\frac{e^{rT_1}u_1+\frac{c_1}{r}(e^{rT_1}-1)}{\delta_1}\wedge\frac{e^{rT_1}u_2+\frac{c_2}{r}(e^{rT_1}-1)}{\delta_2}\right]\\
&=E\Bigg[e^{-sT_1}E_{(U_1(T_1),U_2(T_1))}[e^{-s\tau}],T_1\le h,\\
&\qquad\sigma_1\le\frac{e^{rT_1}u_1+\frac{c_1}{r}(e^{rT_1}-1)}{\delta_1}\wedge\frac{e^{rT_1}u_2+\frac{c_2}{r}(e^{rT_1}-1)}{\delta_2}\Bigg]\\
&=\int_0^h\lambda e^{-\lambda t}dt\int_0^{\frac{e^{rt}u_1+\frac{c_1}{r}(e^{rt}-1)}{\delta_1}\wedge\frac{e^{rt}u_2+\frac{c_2}{r}(e^{rt}-1)}{\delta_2}}e^{-st}\\
&\quad\times\Psi_{\min}\left(e^{rt}u_1+\frac{c_1}{r}(e^{rt}-1)-\delta_1z,e^{rt}u_2+\frac{c_2}{r}(e^{rt}-1)-\delta_2z,s\right)f(z)dz. \qquad (2.8)
\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, if $\sigma_1>\frac{e^{rT_1}u_1+\frac{c_1}{r}(e^{rT_1}-1)}{\delta_1}\wedge\frac{e^{rT_1}u_2+\frac{c_2}{r}(e^{rT_1}-1)}{\delta_2}$, then $\tau(u_1,u_2)=T_1$, and thus

$$\begin{aligned}
&E\left[e^{-s\tau(u_1,u_2)},T_1\le h,\sigma_1>\frac{e^{rT_1}u_1+\frac{c_1}{r}(e^{rT_1}-1)}{\delta_1}\wedge\frac{e^{rT_1}u_2+\frac{c_2}{r}(e^{rT_1}-1)}{\delta_2}\right]\\
&=E\left[e^{-sT_1},T_1\le h,\sigma_1>\frac{e^{rT_1}u_1+\frac{c_1}{r}(e^{rT_1}-1)}{\delta_1}\wedge\frac{e^{rT_1}u_2+\frac{c_2}{r}(e^{rT_1}-1)}{\delta_2}\right]\\
&=\int_0^h\lambda e^{-\lambda t}dt\int_{\frac{e^{rt}u_1+\frac{c_1}{r}(e^{rt}-1)}{\delta_1}\wedge\frac{e^{rt}u_2+\frac{c_2}{r}(e^{rt}-1)}{\delta_2}}^\infty e^{-st}f(z)dz. \qquad (2.9)
\end{aligned}$$

By (2.5)-(2.9), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Psi_{\min}(u_1,u_2,s)\\
&= e^{-(\lambda+s)h}\Psi_{\min}\left(e^{rh}u_1+\frac{c_1}{r}(e^{rh}-1), e^{rh}u_2+\frac{c_2}{r}(e^{rh}-1), s\right)\\
&\quad+\int_0^h \lambda e^{-\lambda t}dt\int_0^{\frac{e^{rt}u_1+\frac{c_1}{r}(e^{rt}-1)}{\delta_1}\wedge\frac{e^{rt}u_2+\frac{c_2}{r}(e^{rt}-1)}{\delta_2}} e^{-st}\\
&\qquad\times\Psi_{\min}\left(e^{rt}u_1+\frac{c_1}{r}(e^{rt}-1)-\delta_1 z, e^{rt}u_2+\frac{c_2}{r}(e^{rt}-1)-\delta_2 z, s\right)f(z)dz\\
&\quad+\int_0^h \lambda e^{-\lambda t}dt\int_{\frac{e^{rt}u_1+\frac{c_1}{r}(e^{rt}-1)}{\delta_1}\wedge\frac{e^{rt}u_2+\frac{c_2}{r}(e^{rt}-1)}{\delta_2}}^{\infty} e^{-st}f(z)dz. \qquad (2.10)
\end{aligned}$$

By the definition of $\Psi_{\min}(\cdot,\cdot,\cdot)$, we know that if $z>\frac{e^{rt}u_1+\frac{c_1}{r}(e^{rt}-1)}{\delta_1}\wedge\frac{e^{rt}u_2+\frac{c_2}{r}(e^{rt}-1)}{\delta_2}$, then $\Psi_{\min}(e^{rt}u_1+\frac{c_1}{r}(e^{rt}-1)-\delta_1 z, e^{rt}u_2+\frac{c_2}{r}(e^{rt}-1)-\delta_2 z, s)=1$. By virtue of this fact and letting $y:=e^{rh}-1$, $q_1:=u_1+\frac{c_1}{r}$ and $q_2:=u_2+\frac{c_2}{r}$, we can rewrite (2.10) by

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Psi_{\min}(u_1,u_2,s)\\
&= e^{-(\lambda+s)h}\Psi_{\min}\left(u_1+q_1y, u_2+q_2y, s\right)\\
&\quad+\int_0^h \lambda e^{-\lambda t}dt\int_0^{\infty} e^{-st}\\
&\qquad\times\Psi_{\min}\left(e^{rt}u_1+\frac{c_1}{r}(e^{rt}-1)-\delta_1 z, e^{rt}u_2+\frac{c_2}{r}(e^{rt}-1)-\delta_2 z, s\right)f(z)dz. \qquad (2.11)
\end{aligned}$$

It's easy to check that $y\uparrow 0$ if and only if $h\downarrow 0$. Hence by (2.11), we have

$$\lim_{y\uparrow 0}\Psi_{\min}(u_1+q_1y, u_2+q_2y, s)=\Psi_{\min}(u_1,u_2,s). \qquad (2.12)$$

By (2.11), for any $h>0$ and $y=e^{rh}-1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
0 \;=\;& \frac{\Psi_{\min}(u_1+q_1y, u_2+q_2y, s)-\Psi_{\min}(u_1,u_2,s)}{y}\\
&+\frac{e^{-(\lambda+s)h}-1}{y}\Psi_{\min}(u_1+q_1y, u_2+q_2y, s)\\
&+\frac{1}{y}\int_0^h \lambda e^{-\lambda t}dt\int_0^{\infty} e^{-st}\\
&\qquad\times\Psi_{\min}\left(e^{rt}u_1+\frac{c_1}{r}(e^{rt}-1)-\delta_1 z, e^{rt}u_2+\frac{c_2}{r}(e^{rt}-1)-\delta_2 z, s\right)f(z)dz
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \frac{\Psi_{\min}(u_1+q_1y,u_2+q_2y,s)-\Psi_{\min}(u_1,u_2,s)}{y}\\
&\quad+\frac{e^{-(\lambda+s)h}-1}{e^{rh}-1}\Psi_{\min}(u_1+q_1y,u_2+q_2y,s)\\
&\quad+\frac{1}{e^{rh}-1}\int_0^h \lambda e^{-\lambda t}dt\int_0^\infty e^{-st}\\
&\qquad\times\Psi_{\min}\left(e^{rt}u_1+\frac{c_1}{r}(e^{rt}-1)-\delta_1 z, e^{rt}u_2+\frac{c_2}{r}(e^{rt}-1)-\delta_2 z, s\right)f(z)dz. \quad (2.13)
\end{aligned}$$

By (2.12), letting $y\uparrow 0, h\downarrow 0$ in the above formula and noticing that (2.2) assures the interchange of limitation and integration, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
q_1\frac{\partial\Psi_{\min}}{\partial u_1}+q_2\frac{\partial\Psi_{\min}}{\partial u_2}-\frac{\lambda+s}{r}\Psi_{\min}&\\
+\frac{\lambda}{r}\int_0^\infty \Psi_{\min}(u_1-\delta_1 z,u_2-\delta_2 z,s)f(z)dz=0.& \quad (2.14)
\end{aligned}$$

Replacing q_1 and q_2 in (2.14) by $u_1+\frac{c_1}{r}$ and $u_2+\frac{c_2}{r}$ respectively, we obtain the integral-differential equation. When $u_1/\delta_1=u_2/\delta_2$, the joint ruin model degenerates into a univariate model, and then by the analysis in [2], we get the boundary condition.

Uniqueness: By using similar arguments in Gerber [6] and noticing (2.11), we define an operator $\mathcal{T}$ by

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{T}g(u_1,u_2,s) &= e^{-(\lambda+s)h}g\left(u_1+q_1y,u_2+q_2y,s\right)\\
&\quad+\int_0^h \lambda e^{-\lambda t}dt\int_0^\infty e^{-st}\\
&\quad\times g\left(e^{rt}u_1+\frac{c_1}{r}(e^{rt}-1)-\delta_1 z, e^{rt}u_2+\frac{c_2}{r}(e^{rt}-1)-\delta_2 z, s\right)f(z)dz,
\end{aligned}$$

for any $h>0$. It can be easily seen that $\Psi_{\min}$ is a fixed point of operator $\mathcal{T}$, as $\mathcal{T}\Psi_{\min}=\Psi_{\min}$. Also, for two different functions g_1 and g_2 we have for any $h>0$ and $s>0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&|\mathcal{T}g_1-\mathcal{T}g_2|\\
&\le e^{-(\lambda+s)h}|g_1\left(u_1+q_1y,u_2+q_2y,s\right)-g_2\left(u_1+q_1y,u_2+q_2y,s\right)|\\
&\quad+\int_0^h \lambda e^{-\lambda t}dt\int_0^\infty e^{-st}\left|g_1\left(e^{rt}u_1+\frac{c_1}{r}(e^{rt}-1)-\delta_1 z, e^{rt}u_2+\frac{c_2}{r}(e^{rt}-1)-\delta_2 z, s\right)\right.\\
&\quad\left.-g_2\left(e^{rt}u_1+\frac{c_1}{r}(e^{rt}-1)-\delta_1 z, e^{rt}u_2+\frac{c_2}{r}(e^{rt}-1)-\delta_2 z, s\right)\right|f(z)dz\\
&\le e^{-(\lambda+s)h}||g_1-g_2||_\infty+\left(\int_0^h \lambda e^{-(\lambda+s)t}dt\right)||g_1-g_2||_\infty\\
&=\frac{\lambda+se^{-(\lambda+s)h}}{\lambda+s}||g_1-g_2||_\infty, \quad (2.15)
\end{aligned}$$

where $||\cdot||_\infty$ is the supremum norm over $(u_1, u_2) \in R^2$. Therefore, $\mathcal{T}$ is a contraction and by Banach's fixed point theorem and (2.2), the solution of (2.3)-(2.4) is unique.

Remark 2.1. One way to obtain the Laplace transform $\Psi_{\min}$ of the joint ruin probability $T_{\min}(u_1, u_2)$ is to solve the above integral-differential equation (2.3)-(2.4) numerically. A natural question arise:

Can we give an analytical representation for the solution to the equation (2.3)-(2.4) in some special cases such as exponential claim sizes ?

Unfortunately, even in the case of exponential claim sizes, we have not found the way to solve the equation (2.3)-(2.4).

2.2. The result about $T_{\max}(u_1, u_2)$

Define the Laplace transform of $T_{\max}(u_1, u_2)$ by

$$\Psi_{\max}(u_1, u_2, s) := E\left[e^{-sT_{\max}(u_1,u_2)}\right], \quad \text{for } s > 0.$$

Then we have the following result.

Theorem 2.2. *For $\frac{u_1}{\delta_1} \le \frac{u_2}{\delta_2}$ and $s > 0$, the function $\Psi_{\max}(\cdot, \cdot, s)$ satisfies the same integral-differential equation (2.3) with the boundary condition*

$$\Psi_{\max}(u_1, \frac{\delta_2}{\delta_1}u_1, s) = E\left[e^{-s\tau_1(u_1)}\right], \tag{2.16}$$

where $f(z)$ is the probability density function of σ_k and τ_1 is the ruin time of risk process $U_1(t)$. Furthermore, $\Psi_{\max}$ is the unique solution of (2.3)-(2.16).

Proof. The proof is almost the same with that of Theorem 2.1, and we need only to notice the following three things:

(1) In this case, (2.7) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} &E[e^{-s\tau(u_1,u_2)}, T_1 \le h] \\ &= E\left[e^{-s\tau(u_1,u_2)}, T_1 \le h, \sigma_1 \le \frac{e^{rT_1}u_1 + \frac{c_1}{r}(e^{rT_1}-1)}{\delta_1} \vee \frac{e^{rT_1}u_2 + \frac{c_2}{r}(e^{rT_1}-1)}{\delta_2}\right] \\ &+E\left[e^{-s\tau}, T_1 \le h, \sigma_1 > \frac{e^{rT_1}u_1 + \frac{c_1}{r}(e^{rT_1}-1)}{\delta_1} \vee \frac{e^{rT_1}u_2 + \frac{c_2}{r}(e^{rT_1}-1)}{\delta_2}\right], \end{aligned}$$

where $\tau(u_1, u_2)$ stands for $T_{\max}(u_1, u_2)$.

(2) $\tau(u_1, u_2) = T_1$, if $\sigma_1 > \frac{e^{rT_1}u_1 + \frac{c_1}{r}(e^{rT_1}-1)}{\delta_1} \vee \frac{e^{rT_1}u_2 + \frac{c_2}{r}(e^{rT_1}-1)}{\delta_2}$.

(3) If $z > \frac{e^{rt}u_1+\frac{c_1}{r}(e^{rt}-1)}{\delta_1} \vee \frac{e^{rt}u_2+\frac{c_2}{r}(e^{rt}-1)}{\delta_2}$, then $\Psi_{\max}(e^{rt}u_1 + \frac{c_1}{r}(e^{rt}-1) - \delta_1 z, e^{rt}u_2 + \frac{c_2}{r}(e^{rt}-1) - \delta_2 z, s) = 1$.

We omit the details.

3. Asymptotics for finite time ruin probabilities

In this section, we consider the finite time ruin probability associated with $T_{\max}(u_1, u_2)$ and $T_{\min}(u_1, u_2)$. The original idea comes from [7, Section 4].

Define $X_i(t) := e^{-rt}U_i(t)/\delta_i, i = 1, 2$. Then $(X_1(t), X_2(t))$ has the same ruin times and probabilities with $(U_1(t), U_2(t))$. Denote $x_i := \frac{u_i}{\delta_i}, p_i := \frac{c_i}{r\delta_i}, i = 1, 2$. Then by (1.4) and our assumptions, we have

$$X_i(t) = x_i + p_i(1 - e^{-rt}) - \sum_{k=1}^{N(t)} e^{-r\theta_k}\sigma_k,\ i = 1, 2, \tag{3.1}$$

where $p_1 > p_2, x_1 \le x_2$.

For $T > 0$, define $\Psi_{\max}(x_1, x_2, T) := P\{T_{\max}(\delta_1 x_1, \delta_2 x_2) \le T\}$. Then we have

$$\Psi_{\max}(x_1, x_2, T) = P\{\exists t \le T\ s.t.\ X_1(t) < 0 \text{ and } X_2(t) < 0\}. \tag{3.2}$$

Alternatively, we can also define $\Psi_{\min}(x_1, x_2, T) := P\{T_{\min}(\delta_1 x_1, \delta_2 x_2) \le T\}$ and get

$$\Psi_{\min}(x_1, x_2, T) = P\{\exists t \le T\ s.t.\ X_1(t) < 0 \text{ or } X_2(t) < 0\}. \tag{3.3}$$

In the following, we will provide asymptotic results on both $\Psi_{\max}(x_1, x_2, T)$ and $\Psi_{\min}(x_1, x_2, T)$ under some condition.

3.1. Asymptotic result about $T_{\max}(u_1, u_2)$

Let $T > 0$, $n \in \mathbf{N}$, and $\{V_k, k = 1, 2, \ldots, n\}$ be a sequence of i.i.d. random variables with the uniform distribution on $(0, T]$. Denote by $(V_1^*, \ldots, V_n^*)$ the ordered statistic of $(V_1, ..., V_n)$. It's well known that conditioning on $\{N(t) = n\}$, the random vectors $(\theta_1, ..., \theta_n)$ and $(V_1^*, \ldots, V_n^*)$ have the same distribution. Assume that $\{V_k, k = 1, 2, \ldots, n\}$ is independent of $\{\sigma_k, k \ge 1\}$. Define $F_T(x) = P[e^{-rV_1}\sigma_1 \le x]$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&P\left\{\sum_{k=1}^{n} e^{-r\theta_k}\sigma_k > x \,\middle|\, N(T)=n\right\} = P\left\{\sum_{k=1}^{n} e^{-rV_k^*}\sigma_k > x\right\} \\
&= P\left\{\sum_{k=1}^{n} e^{-rV_k}\sigma_k > x\right\} = \overline{F_T}^{*n}(x),
\end{aligned} \tag{3.4}$$

where ${F_T}^{*n}(x)$ stands for the n-multiple convolution of $F_T(x)$.

Theorem 3.1. *If σ_k has a regularly varying tail with $P\{\sigma_k > x\} = L(x)/x^\alpha$, where L is continuous, slowly varying, $\lim_{x\to\infty} L(x) = \infty$, and $\alpha > 0$. Then for any $T > 0$, we have*

$$\lim_{x_2 \ge x_1 \to \infty} \frac{\Psi_{\max}(x_1, x_2, T)}{\lambda T \overline{F_T}(x_2)} = 1. \tag{3.5}$$

Before proving Theorem 3.1, we need one lemma.

Lemma 3.1. *Suppose that σ_k satisfies the condition in Theorem 3.1. Then F_T has a regularly varying tail.*

Proof. By the independence of V_1 and σ_1, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\overline{F_T}(x) &= P\{e^{-rV_1}\sigma_1 > x\} \\
&= \int_0^T P\{e^{-ry}\sigma_1 > x\}\frac{1}{T}dy \\
&= \frac{1}{T}\int_0^T \frac{L(e^{ry}x)}{(e^{ry}x)^\alpha}dy := \frac{S(x)}{x^\alpha},
\end{aligned}$$

where $S(x) = \frac{1}{T}\int_0^T \frac{L(e^{ry}x)}{(e^{ry})^\alpha}dy$, which together with the assumption that L is continuous and $\lim_{x\to\infty} L(x) = \infty$ implies that

$$\lim_{x\to\infty} S(x) = \infty. \tag{3.6}$$

By the change of variable, we get that

$$S(x) = \frac{x^\alpha}{rT}\int_x^{e^{rT}x} \frac{L(u)}{u^{\alpha+1}}du. \tag{3.7}$$

For any $t > 0$, by (3.6), (3.7) and the fact that L is a slowing varying function, we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\lim_{x\to\infty}\frac{S(tx)}{S(x)}=\lim_{x\to\infty}\frac{t^{\alpha}\int_{tx}^{e^{rT}tx}\frac{L(u)}{u^{\alpha+1}}du}{\int_{x}^{e^{rT}x}\frac{L(u)}{u^{\alpha+1}}du}=\lim_{x\to\infty}\frac{t^{\alpha}\left(\frac{L(e^{rT}tx)}{(e^{rT}tx)^{\alpha+1}}e^{rT}t-\frac{L(tx)}{(tx)^{\alpha+1}}t\right)}{\frac{L(e^{rT}x)}{(e^{rT}x)^{\alpha+1}}e^{rT}-\frac{L(x)}{x^{\alpha+1}}}\\
&=\lim_{x\to\infty}\frac{\frac{L(e^{rT}tx)}{(e^{rT})^{\alpha}}-L(tx)}{\frac{L(e^{rT}x)}{(e^{rT})^{\alpha}}-L(x)}=\lim_{x\to\infty}\frac{\frac{L(e^{rT}tx)}{L(e^{rT}x)}-(e^{rT})^{\alpha}\frac{L(tx)}{L(e^{rT}x)}}{1-(e^{rT})^{\alpha}\frac{L(x)}{L(e^{rT}x)}}\\
&=\frac{1-(e^{rT})^{\alpha}}{1-(e^{rT})^{\alpha}}=1.
\end{aligned}
$$

Hence F_T has a regularly varying tail.

Proof of Theorem 3.1. By Lemma 3.1 and [1, Proposition IX.1.4], we know that F_T is a subexponential distribution. By (3.2) and (3.18), we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\Psi_{\max}(x_1,x_2,T)\\
&=P\left\{\sum_{k=1}^{N(t)}e^{-r\theta_k}\sigma_k>x_i+p_i(1-e^{-rt}),i=1,2,\text{ for some }t\le T\right\}\\
&\ge P\left\{\sum_{k=1}^{N(T)}e^{-r\theta_k}\sigma_k>x_i+p_i(1-e^{-rT}),i=1,2\right\}\\
&=\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}P\{N(T)=n\}\\
&\quad\times P\left\{\sum_{k=1}^{n}e^{-r\theta_k}\sigma_k>x_i+p_i(1-e^{-rT}),i=1,2\,\middle|\,N(T)=n\right\}.
\end{aligned}
\tag{3.8}
$$

If $x_1+p_1(1-e^{-rT})\ge x_2+p_2(1-e^{-rT})$, then by (3.18) and the assumption that $x_2\ge x_1$, we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
&P\left\{\sum_{k=1}^{n}e^{-r\theta_k}\sigma_k>x_i+p_i(1-e^{-rT}),i=1,2\,\middle|\,N(T)=n\right\}\\
&=P\left\{\sum_{k=1}^{n}e^{-r\theta_k}\sigma_k>x_1+p_1(1-e^{-rT})\,\middle|\,N(T)=n\right\}\\
&=\overline{F_T}^{*n}(x_1+p_1(1-e^{-rT})),
\end{aligned}
\tag{3.9}
$$

and $x_2+p_1(1-e^{-rT})\ge x_1+p_1(1-e^{-rT})\ge x_2+p_2(1-e^{-rT})>x_2$, which implies that

$$
\overline{F_T}^{*n}(x_2+p_1(1-e^{-rT}))\le\overline{F_T}^{*n}(x_1+p_1(1-e^{-rT}))\le\overline{F_T}^{*n}(x_2),
$$

and thus

$$\frac{\overline{F_T}^{*n}(x_2+p_1(1-e^{-rT}))}{\overline{F_T}^{*n}(x_2)} \le \frac{\overline{F_T}^{*n}(x_1+p_1(1-e^{-rT}))}{\overline{F_T}^{*n}(x_2)} \le 1. \tag{3.10}$$

Since F_T is a subexponential distribution, by [1, Proposition IX.1.5] and (3.10), it holds that

$$\liminf_{x_1\to\infty} \frac{\overline{F_T}^{*n}(x_1+p_1(1-e^{-rT}))}{\overline{F_T}^{*n}(x_2)} = 1. \tag{3.11}$$

By Fatou's Lemma, (3.11) and [1, Proposition IX.1.7], we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\liminf_{x_1\to\infty} \frac{\sum\limits_{n=0}^{\infty} P\{N(T)=n\}\overline{F_T}^{*n}(x_1+p_1(1-e^{-rT}))}{\lambda T\overline{F_T}(x_2)}\\
&= \liminf_{x_1\to\infty} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} P\{N(T)=n\} \frac{\overline{F_T}^{*n}(x_1+p_1(1-e^{-rT}))}{\overline{F_T}^{*n}(x_2)} \frac{\overline{F_T}^{*n}(x_2)}{\lambda T\overline{F_T}(x_2)}\\
&\ge \frac{1}{\lambda T}\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} P\{N(T)=n\} \liminf_{x_1\to\infty} \frac{\overline{F_T}^{*n}(x_1+p_1(1-e^{-rT}))}{\overline{F_T}^{*n}(x_2)} \liminf_{x_1\to\infty} \frac{\overline{F_T}^{*n}(x_2)}{\overline{F_T}(x_2)}\\
&= \frac{1}{\lambda T}\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} P\{N(T)=n\} \liminf_{x_1\to\infty} \frac{\overline{F_T}^{*n}(x_2)}{\overline{F_T}(x_2)}\\
&= \frac{1}{\lambda T}\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} P\{N(T)=n\} n\\
&= \frac{1}{\lambda T} E[N(t)] = 1.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.12}$$

By (3.8), (3.9) and (3.12) and under the condition that $x_1+p_1(1-e^{-rT}) \ge x_2+p_2(1-e^{-rT})$, we have that

$$\liminf_{x_1\to\infty} \frac{\Psi_{max}(x_1,x_2,T)}{\lambda T\overline{F_T}(x_2)} \ge 1.$$

If $x_1+p_1(1-e^{-rT}) < x_2+p_2(1-e^{-rT})$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
&P\left[\sum_{k=1}^{n} e^{-r\theta_k}\sigma_k > x_i+p_i(1-e^{-rT}), i=1,2 \middle| N(T)=n\right]\\
&= P\left[\sum_{k=1}^{n} e^{-r\theta_k}\sigma_k > x_2+p_2(1-e^{-rT}) \middle| N(T)=n\right]\\
&= \overline{F_T}^{*n}(x_2+p_2(1-e^{-rT})).
\end{aligned} \tag{3.13}$$

Since F_T is a subexponential distribution and $x_2 \ge x_1$, by [1, Proposition IX.1.5] we have

$$\lim_{x_1\to\infty} \frac{\overline{F_T}^{*n}(x_2+p_2(1-e^{-rT}))}{\overline{F_T}^{*n}(x_2)} = 1. \tag{3.14}$$

Now By (3.8), (3.13) and (3.14), similar to the arguments in (3.12), we obtain that under the condition that $x_1 + p_1(1 - e^{-rT}) < x_2 + p_2(1 - e^{-rT})$

$$\liminf_{x_1 \to \infty} \frac{\Psi_{max}(x_1, x_2, T)}{\lambda T \overline{F_T}(x_2)} \geq 1.$$

Hence we always have

$$\liminf_{x_1 \to \infty} \frac{\Psi_{max}(x_1, x_2, T)}{\lambda T \overline{F_T}(x_2)} \geq 1. \tag{3.15}$$

On the other hand, by the assumption that $x_2 \geq x_1$, and (3.18), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Psi_{\max}(x_1, x_2, T) \\
&= P\left\{ \sum_{k=1}^{N(t)} e^{-r\theta_k}\sigma_k > x_i + p_i(1 - e^{-rt}), i = 1, 2, \text{ for some } t \leq T \right\} \\
&\leq P\left\{ \sum_{k=1}^{N(T)} e^{-r\theta_k}\sigma_k > x_2 \right\} \\
&= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} P\{N(T) = n\} P\left\{ \sum_{k=1}^{n} e^{-r\theta_k}\sigma_k > x_2 \,\middle|\, N(T) = n \right\} \\
&= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} P\{N(T) = n\} \overline{F_T{}^{*n}}(x_2).
\end{aligned}$$

By Fatou's Lemma, the above formula and [1, Proposition IX.1.7], we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\limsup_{x_1 \to \infty} \frac{\Psi_{max}(x_1, x_2, T)}{\lambda T \overline{F_T}(x_2)} \\
&\leq \limsup_{x_1 \to \infty} \frac{\sum\limits_{n=0}^{\infty} P\{N(T) = n\} \overline{F_T{}^{*n}}(x_2)}{\lambda T \overline{F_T}(x_2)} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{\lambda T} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} P\{N(T) = n\} \limsup_{x_1 \to \infty} \frac{\overline{F_T{}^{*n}}(x_2)}{\overline{F_T}(x_2)} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{\lambda T} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} P\{N(T) = n\} n \\
&= \frac{1}{\lambda T} E[N(t)] = 1.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.16}$$

It follows from (3.15) and (3.16) that (3.5) holds.

3.2. Asymptotic result about $T_{\min}(u_1, u_2)$

By Theorem 3.1 we can easily obtain the asymptotic result for $\Psi_{\min}(x_1, x_2, T)$, which is formulated as follow:

Theorem 3.2. *If σ_k has a regularly varying tail with $P\{\sigma_k > x\} = L(x)/x^{\alpha}$, where L is continuous, slowly varying, $\lim_{x\to\infty} L(x) = \infty$, and $\alpha > 0$. Then for any $T > 0$, we have*

$$\lim_{x_2 \geq x_1 \to \infty} \frac{\Psi_{\min}(x_1, x_2, T)}{\lambda T \overline{F_T}(x_1)} = 1. \tag{3.17}$$

Proof. First, for $i = 1, 2$, define

$$\psi_i(x_i, T) = P\{\exists\ t \leq T\ s.t.\ X_i(t) < 0\},$$

i.e. $\psi_i(x_i, T)(i = 1, 2)$ represents the ruin probability of $X_i(t)(i = 1, 2)$ within finite time T.

Notice the fact that

$$\begin{aligned} &P\{\exists t \leq T\ s.t.\ X_1(t) < 0 \text{ and } X_2(t) < 0\} \\ &= P\{\exists t \leq T\ s.t.\ X_1(t) < 0\} + P\{\exists t \leq T\ s.t.\ X_2(t) < 0\} - P\{\exists t \leq T\ s.t.\ X_1(t) < 0 \text{ or } X_2(t) < 0\}. \end{aligned}$$

Then by (3.2) and (3.3), we have

$$\Psi_{\max}(x_1, x_2, T) = \psi_1(x_1, T) + \psi_2(x_2, T) - \Psi_{\min}(x_1, x_2, T). \tag{3.18}$$

By Lemma 3.1, F_T is a subexponential distribution. Then by [1, Proposition IX.1.5], for $i = 1, 2$, we have

$$\lim_{x_2 \geq x_1 \to \infty} \frac{\psi_i(x_i, T)}{\lambda T \overline{F_T}(x_i)} = 1. \tag{3.19}$$

By (3.18), (3.19), (3.5), and the fact that $x_2 \geq x_1$, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| \frac{\Psi_{\min}(x_1, x_2, T)}{\lambda T \overline{F_T}(x_1)} - 1 \right| \\ &= \left| \frac{\psi_1(x_1, T) - \lambda T \overline{F_T}(x_1) + \psi_2(x_2, T) - \Psi_{\max}(x_1, x_2, T)}{\lambda T \overline{F_T}(x_1)} \right| \\ &\leq \left| \frac{\psi_1(x_1, T) - \lambda T \overline{F_T}(x_1)}{\lambda T \overline{F_T}(x_1)} \right| + \left| \frac{\psi_2(x_2, T) - \Psi_{\max}(x_1, x_2, T)}{\lambda T \overline{F_T}(x_2)} \right| \cdot \left| \frac{\overline{F_T}(x_2)}{\overline{F_T}(x_1)} \right| \\ &\leq \left| \frac{\psi_1(x_1, T) - \lambda T \overline{F_T}(x_1)}{\lambda T \overline{F_T}(x_1)} \right| + \left| \frac{\psi_2(x_2, T) - \Psi_{\max}(x_1, x_2, T)}{\lambda T \overline{F_T}(x_2)} \right| \to 0, \text{ as } x_2 \geq x_1 \to \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Acknowledgements

The authors acknowledge the helpful suggestions and comments of one anonymous referee, which helped improve the first version of this manuscript. We are grateful to the support of NNSFC (Grant No. 10801072).

References

[1] Asmussen, S. (2000). *Ruin Probabilities.* World Scientific.

[2] Avram, F., Palmowski, Z. and Pistorius, M. (2008). A two-dismensional ruin problem on the positive quadrant. *Insurance Math. Econom.* **42,** 227-234.

[3] Cai, J. and Li, H.J. (2005). Multivariate risk model of phase type. *Insurance Math. Econom.* **36,** 137-152.

[4] Cai, J. and Li, H.J. (2007). Dependence properties and bounds for ruin probabilities in multivariate compound risk models. *J. Multivar. Anal.* **98,** 757-773.

[5] Chan, W.S., Yang, H. and Zhang, L. (2003). Some results on ruin probabilities in a two-dimensional risk model. *Insurance Math. Econom.* **32,** 345-358.

[6] Gerber, H.U. (1981). On the probability of ruin in the presence of a linear dividend barrier. *Scand. Actuarial J.* 105-115.

[7] Li, J.H., Liu, Z.M. and Tang, Q.H. (2007). On the ruin probabilities of a bidimensional perturbed risk model. *Insurance Math. Econom.* **41,** 185-195.

[8] Paulsen, J. (2008). Ruin models with investment income. *Probability Surveys.* **5,** 416-434.

[9] Protter, P. (1992). *Stochastic Integration and Differential Equations: A New Approach.* Springer, Berlin.

[10] Rolski, T., Schmidli, H., Schimidt, V. and Teugels, J. (1999). *Stochastic Processes for Finance and Insurance.* Wiley, New York.

[11] Yuen, K.C., Guo, J.Y. and Wu, X.Y. (2006). On the first time of ruin in the bivariate compound Poisson model. *Insurance Math. Econom.* **38,** 298-308.